[Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai.]

THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE.

PRESIDENT: At the selection held last Friday evening, the following gentlemen were elected by the non-official members of the Council to sit on the University Committee:

Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai;

Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai;

Mr. K. Paramesvaran Pillai; and

Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai.

THE NAIR REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: Sir, I move that the Nair Regulation Amendment Bill be read in Council.

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: I second it.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: The motion having been seconded, though not by a member of my community, I wish I may be permitted to make a few observations on the principle of the bill. The alarming growth of family dissensions and the unquenchable thirst for litigation in the Nair community were definitely recognised by prominent members of the community, some years ago, to be bringing about a steady and continual deterioration in the moral and material prosperity of Nair *tarwads*. As the result of a careful diagnosis, the disease of the *tarwad* was traced to the evil effects of the joint family system in which the individual has no defined right or responsibility, where the incentive to personal exertion is the happiness of other people's children, and where the manager is compelled to maintain a host of sturdy irregulars over whom he has no manner of control. The principal ingredients prescribed by a committee of experts to arrest the growth of this disease, were *thavazhee* partition and a mixed system of inheritance. Unfortunately, when the committee's recommendations came up before the legislature, it failed to discharge its duties to the community, they say out of deference to the opinions of some of the Nair councillors and in pursuance of a policy of benevolent neutrality adopted by the Government in matters of social legislation. However, the halting provisions made by the committee in their draft bill dwindled down to Regulation I of 1088. The Nairs accepted the regulation, though not without demur, but continued their agitation in a more organised and intensified form, focussing their entire attention on the question of *makkathayam* and individual partition. The cry for these changes is so loud, so persistent and so large in volume that it may be safely taken to be the delibrate desire of the community as a whole. Of course, there is hardly any question without advocates of its other side. Accordingly there is still to be seen a negligible minority opposed to all changes. In their discussion on the question of partition, the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly